

## REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the final Office Action mailed March 24, 2008. Claims 1-23 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. Claim 24 has been added, and claims 1, 11, and 20-23 are being amended. Accordingly, claims 1-24 remain for the Examiner's consideration, with claims 1, 11, and 20 being independent. Support for such amendments and new claims are provided in the application as originally filed, thus no new matter has been added. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections are respectfully requested.

### **I. Election/Restriction**

Claims 21-23 were withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. Applicants have amended these claims in a manner which is believed to overcome this rejection, and thus, it is respectfully requested that the withdrawal of these claims be reconsidered.

### **II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph**

Claims 1-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, claims 1, 11, and 20 have the limitation an interceptor "receives initial message context ... including a plurality of components each of which includes corresponding content" and "modifies the content of one or more of the components of the initial message context to produce modified message context for the web service, the modified message context including the same plurality of components as the initial message context but with the content of one or more components differing from the initial message context..." In the Office Action on page 3, it was alleged that these limitations are not found in Applicants' original specification and claim language.

To overcome this rejection, Applicants have replaced the term "components" with "parts", because it appears that the Examiner was concerned about the use of the term component. For example, claim 1 as amended now specifies that "an interceptor .... receives initial message context for the invoke request for the web service from said container driver, the initial message context including a plurality of **parts** each of which includes corresponding content". Claim 1 as amended

also specifies that the interceptor “modifies the content of one or more of the **parts** of the initial message context to produce modified message context for the web service, the modified message context including the same plurality of **parts** as the initial message context but with the content of one or more **parts** differing from the initial message context” (emphasis added).

Applicants assert that Applicants’ specification, as originally filed, provides support for these features of claim 1. For example, paragraph [0039] of Applicants’ specification explains that message context can include, e.g., “the request, a placeholder for a response, information about the transport, and information about the target invocation handler”, all of which are examples of **parts** of message context. Further, paragraph [0033] of Applicants’ specification explains that message context can include a header part, which may be operated on by a header handler type of interceptor. Further, paragraph [0033] of Applicants’ specification explains a flow handler type of interceptor can operate on all “message parts”, and thus, on full message content.

Fig. 2 of the Application shows that Message Context (Msg Ctx) is received by an interceptor (e.g., 202) from the container driver 200. In other words, Fig. 2 clearly shows that “an interceptor ... receives initial message context for the invoke request for the web service from said container driver”. Fig. 2 also shows that the interceptor returns Message Context (after it has been modified) to the container driver 200, so that the container driver 200 can pass the modified Message Context to the invocation handler 208. Paragraphs [0032] and [0033], for example, explain that an interceptor modifies message context. Claim 1 as originally filed also explains that an interceptor modifies message context.

Paragraph [0033] explains that a header handler type interceptor operates on the message header, which makes it clear that in such a case the initial message context and the modified message context both include a header part. Paragraph [0033] also explains that a flow handler type interceptor can operate on all the parts of the message, but once again, is not changing the parts of the message, i.e., the resulting modified message context still including the same parts, e.g., a request, a response (or placeholder therefore), etc.

In view of the amendment to claim 1, and the remarks above, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, rejection of claim 1 be reconsidered and withdrawn. Also, for similar reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, rejections of claims 11 and 20 also be reconsidered and withdrawn.

### III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Amirisetty et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,152,090, hereinafter Amirisetty).

Exemplary **claim 1**, as amended, is reproduced below, for the convenience of the Examiner.

1. A storage medium including software system applications for providing access to web services, comprising:

a container driver that accepts an invoke request for a web service from a client;

an interceptor that

receives initial message context for the invoke request for the web service from said container driver, the initial message context including a plurality of parts each of which includes corresponding content, and

modifies the content of one or more of the parts of the initial message context to produce modified message context for the web service, the modified message context including the same plurality of parts as the initial message context but with the content of one or more parts differing from the initial message context; and,

an invocation handler that receives the modified message context from said container driver, passes parameters from the modified message context to the target of the request, processes values returned from the target, and passes the values to the container driver, such that the container driver can formulate a response to the invoke request.

Claim 1 as amended makes it clear that the claimed interceptor modifies the content of one or more of the parts of the initial message context to produce modified message context for the web service, the modified message context including the same plurality of parts as the initial message context but with the content of one or more parts differing from the initial message context. In other words, the parts of the initial message context and the modified message context do not differ, rather only the content of one or more such parts differ (e.g., the content of the header part may differ).

It was asserted in the Office Action that Figs. 5-7 and column 13, line 65 – column 16, line 45 of Amiresetty teaches the above mentioned features of claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree, as explained below.

Amirisetty provides a system and method of using a metadata-aware Enterprise Application Integration (EAI) framework in a container (e.g. application server) to map a high-level function call generated by an application to a series of low-level function calls for which an interface is provided through a connector to a system (e.g. EIS) external to the container (see column 5, lines 13-19). For example, Amirisetty discusses transforming a data object from business XML data into protocol XML data via a series of low-level calls. In other words, Amirisetty creates a plurality of low-level function calls based on a single high-level function call. Amirisetty can do this for multiple high-level function calls. Presuming a high-level function call includes initial message context (including a plurality of parts each of which includes corresponding content), the plurality of low-level function calls generated by Amirisetty (which are presumably the “modified message context”) will clearly NOT have same plurality of parts as the initial message context. Rather, the plurality of low-level function calls will certainly have a different plurality of parts than the initial high-level function call. This is an inherent difference between high-level function calls and low-level function calls.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the 102(e) rejection of claim 1 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**Claims 2-10** depend from and add additional features to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 2-10 are patentable for at least the reasons that they depend from claim 1.

Independent **claim 11**, as amended, includes the steps of:

“receiving an initial message context for an invoke request for a web service, the initial message context including a plurality of parts each of which includes corresponding content; and

modifying the content of one or more of the parts of the initial message context to produce modified message context for the web service, the modified message context

including the same plurality of parts as the initial message context but with the content of one or more parts differing from the initial message context.”

Applicants assert that these steps of claim 11 are not disclosed in Amirisetty for similar reasons to those discussed above with regards to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 102(e) rejection of claim 11 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**Claims 12-20** depend from and add additional features to claim 11. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 12-20 are patentable for at least the reasons that they depend from claim 11.

Independent **claim 20**, as amended, is directed to:

“A computer readable medium, including instructions stored thereon which when executed by the computer cause the computer to perform certain steps, including:

receiving, at an interceptor, initial message context for the invoke request for the web service from the container driver, the initial message context including a plurality of parts each of which includes corresponding content; and

modifying, at the interceptor, the content of one or more of the parts of the initial message context to produce modified message context for the web service, the modified message context including the same plurality of parts as the initial message context but with the content of one or more parts differing from the initial message context.”

Applicants assert that these features of claim 20 are not disclosed in Amirisetty for similar reasons to those discussed above with regards to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 102(e) rejection of claim 20 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

#### **IV. New Claims**

New **claim 24** also depends from and adds additional features to claim 1. More specifically, claim 24 requires that the initial message context and the modified message context each include transport information, wherein the transport information comprises information specific to the

transport over which the request came, and over which the response is sent. Support for new claim 24 is provided, e.g., in paragraphs [0027] and [0039]. Applicants respectfully assert that Amirisetty clearly does not teach the features of claim 24.

## **V. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if she can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge the required fees and any underpayment of fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 27, 2008

By: /Jeffrey R. Kurin/  
Jeffrey R. Kurin  
Reg. No. 41,132

FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
650 California Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800  
Customer No.: 80548